

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00271 051815Z

44

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 086727

P 051735Z AUG 75

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2690

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 271

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS, AUGUST 5, 1975
(SALT TWO -713)

1. MIRVS: SHCHUKIN (TO MAY, A-938) WELCOMED ROWNY'S MIRV EXPOSITION AS IT MADE CLEAR BOTH SIDES AGREED THAT ESSENTIAL FEATURE OF MIRVS WAS THE ABILITY TO AIM THE RVS INDEPENDENTLY OF EACH OTHER TO PRESELECTED TARGETS. SHCHUKIN SAID US DEFINITION HAD LED HIM TO QUESTION WHETHER MRVS WHICH COULD BE ORIENTED SO AS TO PROVIDE DIFFERENT TARGET COVERAGE BOTH IN DOWN RANGE AND CROSS RANGE DIRECTIONS WERE INCLUDED IN US MIRV DEFINITION. MAY SAID THEY WERE NOT AND SHCHUKIN SAID HE WAS GLAD "MISUNDERSTANDING" HAD BEEN CLEARED UP.

2. MAY ASKED IF WORDS "AFTER SEPARATION FROM THE BOOSTER ROCKET" IN SOVIET DEFINITION MEANT THAT MULTIPLE INDEPENDENTLY AIMED REENTRY VEHICLES WHICH UTILIZED THE LAST STAGE AS A SOURCE OF THRUST OR ENERGY WERE EXCLUDED FROM THE SOVIET MIRV DEFINITION. SHCHUKIN REPLIED EMPHATICALLY IN THE NEGATIVE. MAY ASKED IF PHRASE IN SOVIET DEFINITION "DEVICES INSTALLED IN THE FRONT END (IN A SELFCONTAINED DISPENSING MECHANISM) OR ON
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00271 051815Z

REENTRY VEHICLES" EXCLUDED SYSTEMS WHICH DERIVE SOME GUIDANCE

INFORMATION FROM EXTERNAL OBJECTS, SUCH AS STAR OR SATELLITE. SHCHUKIN ANSWERED THAT SUCH SYSTEMS WERE PERMITTED BUT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRVS WITHOUT REGARD TO MEANS OF GUIDANCE IF RVS COULD BE DIRECTED INDEPENDENTLY -- THAT WAS THE KEY MATTER.

3. CRUISE MISSILES: SHCHUKIN ASKED MAY (A-938) WHY US CONCERNED ITSELF ABOUT CONCEPT WITHOUT GREAT UTILITY SUCH AS FOBS, AND YET LEFT DANGLING THE QUESTION OF WHETHER TO BAN INTERCONTINENTAL CRUISE MISSILES (ICCMS). HE STATES THAT IF ICCMS WERE NOT BANNED, THEY WOULD GO FREE. MAY INTERJECTED THAT THERE WAS POSSIBILITY OF INCLUDING THEM WITH THE 2400 AGGREGATE. SHCHUKIN SAID THAT IF US MADE SUCH A PROPOSAL, IT COULD BE CONSIDERED BUT US HAD MADE NO PROPOSAL IN THIS REGARD. MAY SAID THAT WAS RIGHT, THAT HE HAD SIMPLY NOTED EXISTENCE OF THE POSSIBILITY, AND COULD MAKE NO PROPOSAL.

4. SHCHUKIN MADE LINKAGE BETWEEN US PROPOSED BAN ON FOBS AND THE SOVIET PROPOSAL BAN ON ICCMS SEVERAL TIMES. HE ALSO STATED THAT THERE HAD BEEN NO US RESPONSE TO ANY OF PROPOSED SOVIET BANS ON VARIOUS CRUISE MISSILES AND THAT THIS MADE FOR MAJOR GAP IN COVERAGE OF POSSIBLE OFFENSIVE ARMS. SHCHUKIN REEMPHASIZED THAT VARIOUS SOVIET PROPOSED CRUISE MISSILE BANS SHOULD BE ADOPTED AND SAID THAT IN ANY CASE, THERE COULD BE NO AGREEMENT WITHOUT SOME SETTLEMENT OF CRUISE MISSILE ISSUE. SHCHUKIN ADDED THAT SOVIETS HAD GIVEN CONSIDERABLE THOUGHT TO FORMULATION OF CRUISE MISSILE DEFINITION BUT HAD NOT SUCCEEDED IN DEVELOPING ONE. THE LINE, IN HIS VIEW, BETWEEN CRUISE AND BALLISTIC MISSILES DOES NOT EXIST.

5. BACKFIRE: TRUSOV (TO ROWNY, A-934) SAID US HAD SIMPLY PICKED FIGURES 20 METRIC TONS AND 10,000 KILIMTERES OUT OF THE SKY, RESORTING TO NEGOTIATOR'S TACTIC OF TRYING TO TRICK THEM INTO RESPONDING WITH CORRECT INFORMATION. ROWNY SAID THESE FIGURES WERE NOT FIGMENT OF OUR IMAGINATION BUT WERE BASED ON DATA ACQUIRED THROUGH NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS, REPRESENTING OUR CONSIDERED ASSESSMENT OF BACKFIRE'S CAPABILITY. TRUSOV SAID WE SHOULD HAVE MUTUAL TRUST AND NOT IGNORE OFFICIAL SOVIET PRONOUNCEMENT THAT BACKFIRE IS MEDIUM BOMBER. TRUSOV SAID SOVIETS HAD NEVER DISCUSSED SPECIFIC TECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF WEAPONS SYSTEMS IN THE PAST AND HE WOULD NOT DISCUSS ANY
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00271 051815Z

SPECIFICS NOW OR IN THE FUTURE. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, MISSILE WARHEADS, NEGOTIATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 AUG 1975
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975SALTT00271
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750270-0222
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750881/aaaactqa.tel
Line Count: 108
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 2
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 19 AUG 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19 AUG 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <03 NOV 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS, AUGUST 5, 1975 (SALT TWO -713)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006